

Roger Williams University

DOCS@RWU

Honors Theses

RWU Theses and Student Work

6-2011

Effect of Crime Type, Citizenship Status, Ethnicity, and Location of Interrogation on Perceptions of Enhanced Interrogation Techniques

Brianna Correia

Roger Williams University, bcorreira005@g.rwu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://docs.rwu.edu/honors_theses



Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Correia, Brianna, "Effect of Crime Type, Citizenship Status, Ethnicity, and Location of Interrogation on Perceptions of Enhanced Interrogation Techniques" (2011). *Honors Theses*. 5.

https://docs.rwu.edu/honors_theses/5

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the RWU Theses and Student Work at DOCS@RWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of DOCS@RWU. For more information, please contact mwu@rwu.edu.



Thesis With Distinction

Senior Project Report

We wish to confirm the successful completion of the accompanying thesis project for the graduating student named below.

Brianna Correia
Student (Name)

With a final grade of A this thesis has satisfied the requirements for an award of *Thesis With Distinction*.

Course *(Title/Number) CJS 41081 (84120) Undergrad Honors Thesis

* Identify appropriate course or independent study.

Melissa Russo
Thesis Supervisor (Name)

[Signature]
Supervisor Signature

ROBERT ENGVALL
Second Reader (Name)

[Signature]
Reader Signature

Petor V. Deekle (for Honors Council)

Director Signature

Date

PLEASE ATTACH THIS FORM TO THE FINAL COPY OF THE PROJECT REPORT AND RETURN IT
BY OR BEFORE JUNE 6, 2011 TO:
CYNTHIA JONES - UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
MAIN LIBRARY, 3RD FLOOR, SUITE 300

Effect of Crime Type, Citizenship Status, Ethnicity, and Location of Interrogation on Perceptions
of Enhanced Interrogation Techniques

Brianna Correia

Bachelor of Science

Criminal Justice

School of Justice Studies

Roger Williams University

June 2011

DEDICATION

“Life is one long process of learning how to earn your wings. Do your best to be someone who will graduate with flying colors.”- Douglas Pagels
In loving memory of my uncle, Todd F. Silvia.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge a number of individuals whose insight and support were essential to the completion of this project, including the participants who assisted with data collection. First and most importantly, I would like to thank Dr. Melissa Russano for presenting me with such an amazing opportunity and experience. Her positive direction throughout this entire journey has inspired me to perform above and beyond. Without her knowledge and guidance, none of this would have been possible. I would also like to thank Dr. Robert Engvall for mentoring me since my first day as an undergraduate. His constructive criticism and valuable insight to this project, as well as throughout my college experience, has influenced my performance beyond words. To Dr. Fadia Narchet, her dedication and prior research completed with Dr. Russano ultimately established a foundation for this project.

I would also like to express my appreciation to Ashley Renshaw for her indispensable availability to assist and support me through stressful times. I am entirely grateful for the lifelong friendship we have built together. Finally, I am fortunate for the people in my life who have shaped me into the person I am today. Matty- you have been a blessing these past five years, through thick and thin. I'll love you forever. To my older brothers, Jesse and Luke, you are the only ones who knew how to make me laugh when I was stressing out! You have taught me that it is important to have fun and live life to the fullest. To my younger siblings, Colby and Katie, you have taught me how satisfying and important it is to be a role model. You both have been the source of my confidence and success. Lastly, my parents, Ed and Kelley Correira, your patience, encouragement, and assistance have taught me that hard work pays off and to never underestimate myself. I cannot express enough my love and appreciation for the both of you. You are my role models.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LITERATURE REVIEW.....	1
METHOD.....	11
<i>Participants</i>	11
<i>Materials and Design</i>	12
<i>Procedure</i>	16
RESULTS.....	17
DISCUSSION.....	19
<i>Limitations</i>	22
<i>Implications and Future Directions</i>	23
CONCLUSION.....	24
REFERENCES.....	26
APPENDICES.....	28

Abstract

The current study asks when, if ever, is it acceptable to use “enhanced” interrogation techniques? A mostly White (90.4%), female (55%) sample of 240 participants read a vignette describing an Italian or Saudi Arabian suspect, who was a U.S. citizen or illegal immigrant, who was interrogated on either a U.S. army base or abroad for one of two crimes: child molestation or terrorism. The study failed to find the hypothesized interaction that participants would be more likely to endorse the use of harsh interrogation tactics when the suspect was Saudi Arabian, an illegal immigrant, accused of terrorism, and interrogated abroad. Instead, an unexpected finding of ethnicity emerged: participants were more likely to endorse the use of harsh techniques when the suspect was Italian. The black sheep effect and reactivity are possible explanations presented, but future research is needed to further explore how these factors affect perceptions of “enhanced” interrogations.

Keywords: torture, enhanced techniques, interrogation, suspect, situational factors, terrorism

Effect of Crime Type, Citizenship Status, Ethnicity, and Location of Interrogation on Perceptions of “Enhanced” Interrogation Techniques

A repeatedly emphasized debate topic featured within the media, public discussion, and casual conversation around the world today is whether the use of torture is ever justified, and if so, under what circumstances. Since the attacks on September 11, 2001, the use of controversial techniques at places such as Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay, have caused the U.S. government and public to question the classification and use of so-called “enhanced” interrogation techniques. The challenge today is developing a definition of torture that is clear and agreed-upon by the vast majority of the public and government agencies. The 1984 United Nations Convention Against Torture, as cited by Norris, Larsen and Stastny (2010), had suggested that torture is “any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person” (p. 276) However, this definition is continuously debated, which further suggests that it is not a universally accepted definition of torture. Society’s view of torture and “enhanced” interrogation tactics evolves with time and circumstances. Thus, the details of the Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay events exposed by the media may have affected American’s perceptions of which factors and situations constitute torture.

In an effort to prevent future degradation and abuse of power within interrogations, and to limit the challenges being presented against the current definition, clarification is needed to distinguish between tactics that are accepted as lawful methods of interrogation and those which cross the line into torture. The current study aims to determine when, if ever, is it acceptable to use “enhanced” interrogation techniques, and whether the perception of what constitutes torture differs depending on suspect and situational factors.

“Enhanced” techniques may appear to be a new development in the discussion of torture, but McSherry (2009) claims that written documentation and photographic evidence demonstrate how this method of interrogation has been utilized throughout several historical events, including the Cold War and the Latin American dirty wars. Some of the “enhanced” interrogation techniques used in today’s war on terror and these past events include near drowning, forced standing, and physical beatings. The rendition program, in which suspects are sent to be interrogated abroad rather than on U.S. soil, is another tactic used over the years. McSherry (2009) asserts that these “enhanced” methods and the extraordinary rendition program “escape democratic control and oversight and pose grave risks to human rights worldwide- and to U.S. democracy” (p.10). Yet, such tactics have been used for years as the U.S. military continues today to “use terror to fight terror” through counterterrorism (p. 11). The use of counterterrorism in the past has been justified by the government and military as an essential means of extracting vital information that was “necessary to save the lives of U.S. citizens” (p. 14). McSherry (2009) argues against this use of “enhanced” techniques by referring to the tactics as torture and providing opinions of other interrogation experts who claim such treatment defies the code of ethics, as well as induces false confessions. Critics of “enhanced” interrogations advocate finding less severe and more humane methods of fighting terrorism while preserving human rights and controlling dictatorship.

Whether a particular technique constitutes “enhanced” interrogation and/or torture is a matter of debate. Still today, there is disagreement about whether the techniques that were permissible under the Bush administration were lawful, albeit aggressive, interrogation techniques or whether they crossed the line into torture. Greenburg, Rosenberg, and de Vogue (2008) discuss how members of the Bush administration endorsed the use of “enhanced”

interrogation techniques by the Central Intelligence Agency during their questioning of al Qaeda terrorist suspects. Examples of such techniques that were declared permissible included using fear and intimidation, hooding, open-handed slaps, deprivation of sleep, isolation, and waterboarding (i.e., simulated drowning) (Greenburg et al., 2008).

Generally, “enhanced” interrogations are viewed as more physically harmful than what is thought by detractors to be necessary to retrieve reliable information. Yet, the determination of whether a technique is “enhanced” or not may rely on the “context” in which the method is introduced. Norris et al. (2010) suggests that there may be a reasoning behind the events of Abu Ghraib that involve the influences of context, such that “the extremely aversive context faced by the American guards led them to think that their actions fell short of torture” (p. 287). Here, context refers to the experiences of the guards outside of the interrogation, such as the “mortar, rifle, and rocket-propelled grenade attacks from beyond the prison walls” (Norris et al., 2010, p. 288). More broadly, context may allude to a variety of circumstances (e.g., location of the interrogation) and suspect factors (e.g., ethnicity); variations in context, whether appropriate or not, may affect perceptions of whether certain techniques are considered “enhanced” or not.

Recent studies have been conducted in an effort to determine which acts are consistently perceived as torture by societal members and whether there are factors that influence their assessment. Norris et al. (2010) studied the mindset of undergraduates in three separate studies. The first study assessed whether there is a generally agreed upon definition of torture. Forty-eight college students read one hundred sentences, each describing a different act inflicted on a prisoner by a guard. After each scenario, the students were asked to rate whether the act was torture using a yes-no nominal scale. In addition, the students were asked to judge what percentage of their peers would view each act as torture, regardless of the participant’s personal

perception. Overall, the study's results showed that there may not be an agreed upon definition of torture. Only sixteen of the one hundred techniques were unanimously considered torture (Norris et al., 2010, p. 279). Hence, this first study suggests that despite being necessary from a public policy perspective, the creation of a specific, agreed-upon definition of torture may be difficult.

In a second study, Norris et al. (2010) investigated how perceptions of torture change depending on the context in which the technique is introduced. The independent variable manipulated between two conditions in this study was the aversiveness of an interrogation technique and how it affects the study's dependent variable judgment of torture. Norris et al. (2010) hypothesized that "moderately aversive acts may be more likely to be considered torture when preceded by less aversive acts as opposed to more aversive acts" (p. 282). Within the study, forty-two college students were randomly assigned to two different conditions pertaining to a guard's treatment of a prisoner. Half of the students were assigned to an extremely aversive condition, which consisted of thirty techniques that were often viewed as torture in their previous study. Examples of techniques in the extremely aversive condition were "the guard violently kicks the prisoner in the stomach" and "the guard shows the prisoner the mock execution of the prisoner's young son" (Norris et al., 2010, p. 283).

The other half of the participants were assigned to a mildly aversive condition consisting of thirty techniques that were rarely rated as torture in Study 1, such as "the guard lets the prisoner's food get cold before serving it to him" and "the guard plays extremely loud music in the prisoner's cell" (Norris et al., 2010, p. 283). All participants also read fifteen additional techniques that were sometimes rated as torture in Norris and colleagues' first study. Therefore, each participant was assigned forty-five techniques to rate, thirty pertaining to the condition the

participant was assigned to and fifteen moderately aversive techniques. Examples of moderately aversive techniques were “the guard refuses to let the prisoner bathe for one week” and “the guard slaps the prisoner’s face with an open hand” (Norris et al, 2010, p. 283).

Participants were asked to respond to a yes-no nominal scale regarding whether they viewed each act as torture. The results indicated that the condition the participant was assigned to affected their perceptions of whether the fifteen moderately aversive techniques constituted torture. Specifically, the moderately aversive techniques were not viewed as torture when surrounded by the extremely aversive acts; however, participants in the mildly aversive condition more often viewed the moderately aversive techniques as torture. Norris et al. (2010) concluded that the definition of what constitutes torture may fluctuate depending on events and details surrounding the acts involved.

In a third study, Norris et al. (2010) explored the role of “in-group biases” in reference to the nationality of the guard and prisoner within a scenario. Consistent with a theory of conservatism and torture by Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, and Sulloway’s (2003), the hypothesis of Norris et al.’s third study was that “people are more likely to consider an act torture when the guard is an outgroup member (i.e., an Iraqi) and the prisoner an ingroup member (i.e., an American) than when the guard is an ingroup member and the prisoner an outgroup member” (p. 285). Thirty-nine college students were randomly assigned to one of two groups: an American guard interrogating an Iraqi prisoner or an Iraqi guard interrogating an American prisoner. Each of the participants was asked to disclose where they stand politically in regards to being liberal or conservative on a 9-point Likert scale.

Next, participants read eleven interrogation techniques and responded on a yes-no nominal scale as to whether they considered the act to be torture. Examples of the techniques

included “The guard forces the prisoner to stand at attention for 4 hours” and “The guard binds the prisoner to a chair for 3 hours” (Norris et al., 2010, p. 292). The researchers found that conservatives were less likely to perceive an act as torture when the guard was American and the prisoner was Iraqi than when the acts were performed by an Iraqi guard on an American prisoner (Norris et al., 2010, p. 275). Liberals’ perceptions were not affected by the ethnicity of the guard or prisoner. The three studies performed by Norris et al. (2010) suggest that reaching a consensus on a definition of torture may be a difficult process; however, it is clear that people’s perceptions of what constitutes torture can be affected by the context in which the techniques are used, including factors such as nationality and political affiliation.

In a conceptually similar line of research, Narchet, Russano, and Griffin (2008) conducted a study to determine whether crime type has an effect on an individual’s perception of the use of harsh interrogation techniques. A sample of eighty participants equally distributed in gender (50% female; 50% male) was used. The political affiliation of the sample was fairly equal in terms of Democrats (37%) and Republicans (32%); the remainder of the sample identified themselves as either Independent or of another party (Narchet et al., 2008). Participants in the study were randomly assigned to read a scenario where a U.S. military soldier on leave was suspected of one of four crimes: terrorism, murder, child molestation, or burglary. In the terrorism condition, the soldier was accused of working with Al-Qaeda to plan a terrorist attack on the Golden Gate Bridge. In the murder condition, the soldier was suspected of being an accessory to a gang murder. In the child molestation condition, the soldier was accused of engaging in sexual relations with a young child, filming a pornographic video of the sexual act, and being affiliated with an international child pornography group (Narchet et al., 2008). Lastly,

in the burglary condition, the soldier was suspected of committing numerous yet to be solved burglaries.

In all conditions, the soldier was taken in to be questioned by military investigators. During the interrogation, investigators decided to use more harsh techniques once it became clear that standard techniques were not working. Examples of the harsh techniques used were:

“grabbing the suspect by his shirt and shaking him, using an open-hand to slap to the face in order to cause mild pain and fear, and administering a hard, open-handed slap to the stomach, which caused pain but not internal injury.” (Narchet et al, 2008, p.1)

When these more aggressive techniques were also unsuccessful in obtaining the suspect’s confession, even more extreme measures were taken. The suspect was placed in an:

“interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit [and] forced to stand naked, handcuffed, and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor for more than 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation” (Narchet et al., 2008, p.1).

In all conditions, after these more aggressive measures were used, the suspect was ready to cooperate and relinquish valuable information. The suspect confessed to his role in the crime and provided information about his accomplices. After reading the scenario, each participant completed a 25-item questionnaire, in which they were asked to rate the appropriateness and justification of the interrogation techniques used, as well as whether they thought the suspect had been tortured.

Narchet et al.’s (2008) found that participants were more likely to believe that the use of the more aggressive techniques was justified, and more likely to endorse the use of most

individual techniques, when the suspect was accused of terrorism or child molestation as compared to burglary. The justification of the interrogation tactics when used with the terrorism suspect logically follows Kleinig's (2005) analysis of Jeremy Bentham's "ticking bomb" theory (p. 614). The argument behind the "ticking bomb" suggests that the use of torture is justifiable when a situation arises that puts the welfare of the country in harm's way by threatening national security. Kleinig suggests that the theory is just another method of "justifying the expanded use of torture" (p. 614). Therefore, the justification of using harsher interrogation tactics on a terrorism suspect is an example of how one would explain this mindset. Terrorism ultimately poses as a larger threat to a greater number of people than does burglary, especially after the ordeal of the September 11, 2001 attacks. Narchet et al. (2008) found a significant main effect of political affiliation on participants' perceptions of whether the interrogation techniques were justified. Specifically, Narchet et al. found that participants who had identified themselves as Republican were more likely to view the techniques as justified as compared to participants who identified themselves as members of either the Democrat or Independent party (Narchet et al., 2008)

In a second study, Narchet and Russano (2009) expanded their research by incorporating an additional factor: citizenship status. A 2 (citizenship status: citizen vs. non-citizen) X 4 (crime type: burglary vs. child molestation vs. murder vs. terrorism) between-participants factorial design experiment was conducted. Eighty participants were randomly assigned to read a scenario similar to those used in Narchet et al.'s (2008) study. The only change made to the scenarios involved the citizenship status manipulation; the soldier was described as either being a U.S. citizen or a legal resident/non-citizen of the United States. In addition to predicting an effect of crime type, Narchet and Russano hypothesized that participants would be more likely to endorse

the use of “enhanced” interrogation techniques when the suspect was a legal resident/non-citizen as opposed to when a suspect was presented as a citizen of the United States.

The results of Narchet and Russano’s (2009) study were consistent with the Narchet et al. (2008) study in that participants’ endorsement of the interrogation techniques was dependent on the crime type the suspect was accused of; participants were most approving of the use of the harsh interrogation techniques when the suspect was accused of terrorism as compared to the other crimes. However, contrary to their expectations, there was no overall effect for the citizenship factor on participants’ perceptions of the appropriateness and the justification of the use of enhanced interrogations techniques. Narchet and Russano (2009) theorized that citizenship status might only matter when examined in conjunction with an ethnicity manipulation.

To explore this possibility, in a third study, Narchet and Russano (2010) conducted a 3 (crime type: burglary vs. child molestation vs. terrorism) X 2 (ethnicity: Italian vs. Saudi Arabian) X 2 (citizenship status: U.S. citizen vs. legal resident/ non-U.S. citizen) between-participants factorial design experiment. Two hundred and twenty-two participants from a predominantly White (81%), female (62%), and young (mean age = 21) sample were randomly assigned to read one of sixteen scenarios. The scenario presented a suspect who was described as an “Arabic translator” employed on a U. S. military base in California, who was accused of either terrorism, child molestation, or burglary. They manipulated the ethnicity of the suspect by presenting the suspect as either Anthony Giordano of Italian descent or Omar Al Harbi of Saudi Arabian descent, and the suspect was described as either a U.S. citizen or a legal resident who had emigrated to the U.S. at age fourteen. The description of the interrogation was identical to those used in Narchet and Russano’s previous studies (Narchet et al., 2008; Narchet & Russano, 2009).

Narchet and Russano's 2010 study replicated their previous findings for the crime type factor, in that participants were more likely to endorse the use of enhanced interrogation techniques when the suspect was accused of terrorism as opposed to child molestation or burglary. They also found an effect of ethnicity, such that participants were more likely to endorse the use of harsh interrogation techniques when the suspect was Saudi Arabian as compared to Italian. Participants also viewed the interrogation as less aggressive when the suspect was Saudi Arabian as compared to Italian, and participants were more likely to believe that the terrorism suspect was guilty as compared to the child molestation and burglary suspects. However, once again, there was no effect of citizenship status on the dependent variables. Narchet and Russano's explanation for this finding suggests that their presentation of the suspect as either a legal resident of the U.S. or a citizen of the U.S. may not have been the best way to manipulate the citizenship status factor. Narchet and Russano theorized that a more distinct difference between the two citizenship statuses was needed where the non-citizen was actually residing in the country illegally. They theorized that people may afford legal residents the same rights and protections as U.S. citizens, but that they would not extend those protections to illegal residents. The current study will explore that possibility.

As detailed above, a few studies have been conducted to begin to determine what factors affect perceptions of enhanced interrogation techniques. Therefore, the purpose of this current study was to continue this line of research by assessing whether crime type, citizenship status, ethnicity, and location of an interrogation affect an individual's perception of the use of enhanced interrogation techniques. Previous studies by Narchet and Russano (2009; 2010) failed to find the anticipated effect of citizenship status, perhaps because the non-citizen was residing in the U.S. legally. In this study, the non-citizen will be described as an illegal immigrant who is

residing in the country illegally after failing to depart the country once his travel visa expired. In addition, the location of the interrogation will be manipulated for the first time in an effort to determine whether people's perception of the appropriateness of enhanced techniques varies depending on whether or not the interrogation occurs on U.S. soil.

It is hypothesized that participants will be most likely to endorse the use of harsh interrogation techniques, and least likely to view the interrogation as torture, when the suspect is an illegal immigrant of Saudi Arabian descent who was accused of terrorism and interrogated abroad. The recent media coverage surrounding the debate on the acceptance and rights of illegal immigrants, the events of Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay, in-group biases, and the "ticking bomb" theory all suggest that participants may be more prone to condoning harsher treatment in this context. In addition, we hypothesize main effects of crime type, citizenship status, ethnicity and location of the interrogation, such that participants will be more likely to endorse the use of harsh techniques, and be less likely to view the interrogation as torture, when the suspect is accused of terrorism as compared to child molestation, when the suspect is an illegal immigrant as opposed to a U.S. citizen, when he is Saudi Arabian as opposed to Italian, and when he is interrogated abroad instead of on U.S. soil.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 240 participants recruited from the New England states of Massachusetts and Rhode Island. Fifty-five percent of the sample was female, and participants ranged in age from 18 to 69 years old ($M = 30.28$, $s = 14.79$; Median = 21). The sample was largely White (90.4%) and well-educated (85% of the participants had at least some college education). In terms of political affiliation, 21.7% of participants identified themselves as

Democrats, 22.5% as Republicans, 35.8% as Independents, 9.6% as Other, and 10.4% did not specify.

Convenience sampling was used; participants were recruited from the Roger Williams University campus community, local business, and easily accessible public areas (e.g., mall food courts). A small percentage of student participants volunteered to participate in exchange for extra credit in one of their courses. The remaining participants received a \$5 gift card to Barnes and Noble bookstore in exchange for their participation. Participation was anonymous; no identifying information was collected.

Materials and Design

The current study employed a 2 (crime type: terrorism vs. child molestation) X 2 (suspect ethnicity: Saudi Arabian vs. Italian) X 2 (citizenship status: illegal immigrant vs. U.S. citizen) X 2 (location of interrogation: foreign soil vs. U.S. soil) between-participants factorial design. Participants were randomly assigned to read one of sixteen possible vignettes (see Appendix A). In each scenario, a janitorial technician working on a U.S. military base in Presidio of Monterey, California was suspected of either child molestation or planning a terrorist attack. In the terrorism condition, the suspect was accused of plotting with an Al-Qaeda cell to blow up the Golden Gate Bridge. In the child molestation condition, the suspect was accused of having sex with a prepubescent child while making a child pornography video in association with an international child pornography ring. To manipulate suspect ethnicity, the suspect was described as either Italian (with the accompanying name of Anthony Giordano) or Saudi Arabian (with the accompanying name of Omar Al Harbi). Citizenship status was manipulated by describing the suspect as either a U.S. citizen or an illegal immigrant who continued to reside in the United States after his visa had expired. Lastly, the location of interrogation was manipulated by either

having the suspect brought to the U.S. base in California for questioning or transferred to a base in Nasr City, Egypt under the extraordinary rendition program.

In all conditions, when typical interrogation tactics did not work, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing the suspect by his shirt and shaking him, using an open-handed slap to the face in order to cause mild pain and fear, and administering a hard, open-handed slap to the stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury. When a full confession was still not forthcoming, the suspect was placed in an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit. The suspect was then forced to stand naked and handcuffed, and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for more than ten hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in an effort to force cooperation. As exhaustion set in, the suspect indicated that he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators. He then confessed to his role in the criminal activity, and he provided the investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

After reading the vignette, all participants were asked to complete the 25-item questionnaire (see Appendix B). The items assessed participant's perceptions of the interrogation, including its harshness, whether they thought the suspect was tortured, and the appropriateness and justification of the various integration techniques used. Participants were also asked about their perceptions of the suspect's guilt and to what extent the confession should be used against the suspect in court. These variables were assessed using 9-point Likert-like scales (e.g., 1 = strongly agree, 9 = strongly disagree). Five of the items were demographic items (i.e., age, race, gender, education, political affiliation), which were operationalized using one nominal scale item each.

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the Likert scale items using a principal components analysis with varimax rotation to extract factors with eigen values over 1.00. The criteria for interpreting factor loadings was set at .55 (meaning there is 30% overlapping variance with the underlying factor), considered “good” by Tabachnick and Fidell (2001). Three underlying factors were extracted with eigen values of 10.22, 1.27, and 1.22; the factor rotation converged in seven iterations. The first factor explained 53.80% of the total variance in participant responses, and the factor appears to represent the participants’ perceptions of the appropriateness/endorsement of the techniques used. The following eleven items loaded on the appropriateness of the techniques factor: (a) appropriate to slap the suspect with an open-hand to the stomach, (b) appropriate to slap the suspect’s face with an open-hand, (c) appropriate to douse the suspect with cold water, (d) appropriate to force the suspect to stand handcuffed and shackled to the floor for ten hours, (e) appropriate to grab the suspect by his shirt and shake him, (f) the interrogation techniques used by investigators were appropriate, (g) the use of enhanced interrogation techniques on the suspect was justified, (h) the interrogation techniques used by the investigators were necessary, (i) I think the interrogation was too harsh, and (j) I think the suspect is guilty **[guilty]**.

The second factor explained 6.68% of the total variance in participant responses, and the factor appears to represent participants’ orientation toward the criminal justice system (i.e., the extent to which they are due process or crime control oriented). The following five items loaded on this factor: (a) I believe criminals forfeit their rights as soon as they commit a crime, (b) I think the suspect’s confession should be used against him in court, (c) I think criminals are treated too leniently by the criminal justice system, (d) I think investigators should have pushed the suspect harder to get more information, and (e) I think the suspect should receive a reduced

sentence because he assisted the investigators [**reduced sentence**]. Lastly, the third factor explained 6.42% of the total variance, and it seems to represent participants' perceptions of whether the suspect was tortured. Three items loaded on this factor: (a) how aggressive the suspect's interrogation was, (b) the suspect was treated too nicely by the investigators, and (c) I think the suspect was tortured.

An internal-consistency reliability analysis was conducted on each of the three factors that emerged. The reliability analysis of the appropriateness of the techniques factor suggested that (j) **guilty** item be removed in order to raise the reliability of the measure. Once this item was dropped, a highly reliable measure was formed by the combination of the remaining ten items ($N = 233$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .970$). Therefore, the ten items were averaged (after reverse-coding items where necessary), and a measure of participants' perceptions of the appropriateness of the techniques used was created. The measure's scale ranged from one to nine, with higher scores indicating greater endorsement of the techniques used.

The reliability analysis of the criminal justice orientation factor suggested that the reliability of the measure would be increased if the (e) **reduced sentence** item was dropped. After dropping that item and reverse-coding other items as needed, the remaining four items were combined to create a reliable measure of participants' criminal justice orientation ($N = 236$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .73$). With a scale ranging from one to nine, higher scores indicating a more crime control orientation. Finally, the reliability analysis of the third factor, perception of torture, indicated an acceptable level of reliability ($N = 239$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .69$). Removal of any of the items lowered the reliability of the measure; therefore, the three items were averaged to create the final measure (after reverse-coding items as necessary). The final measure utilized a nine-

point scale, with lower scores indicating stronger belief that the suspect was tortured as compared to higher numbers.

In summary, data reduction analyses of the questionnaire items resulted in the emergence of three reliable dependent measures. The two primary dependent variables of interest were a ten-item measure of perceptions of the appropriateness of the interrogation techniques used/endorsement of the techniques used and a three-item measure of participants' perceptions of whether the suspect was tortured. In addition, a four-item measure of the participant's orientation toward the criminal justice system emerged.

Procedure

Convenience sampling was used to gather the 240 participants used in this study. Easily accessible locations on the Roger Williams University campus, such as the university bookstore, library and classrooms, as well as local Massachusetts and Rhode Island businesses were utilized for data recruitment and collection purposes. An effort was made to obtain as diverse a sample as possible (although the final diversity of the sample was quite limited). Potential participants were informed that the study being conducted dealt with perceptions of enhanced interrogations, and that in exchange for their participation, they would receive either extra credit in a course or a \$5 gift card to Barnes and Noble bookstore.

The concept of anonymity was stressed to the individuals beforehand to ensure that they felt comfortable being honest in their responses. No identifying information was collected from participants on their questionnaires, and consent forms (Appendix C) were separated from the survey. After completing an informed consent agreement that explained there were no adverse effects associated with participation, participants were given as much time as needed to complete the survey. Once finished, there was a brief debriefing period which involved the researcher

explaining the purpose of the survey, answering questions, and thanking the participants for their time and effort.

Results

A series of 2 (crime type: terrorism vs. child molestation) X 2 (suspect ethnicity: Saudi Arabian vs. Italian) X 2 (citizenship status: illegal immigrant vs. U.S. citizen) X 2 (location of interrogation: foreign vs. U.S. soil) between-participants factorial ANOVAs were conducted to explore whether there were any significant interactions or main effects on each of the three primary dependent variables. An alpha of .05 was used for all analyses, unless otherwise noted.

To review, the primary hypothesis of this study was that there would be a four-way interaction, such that participants would be most likely to endorse the use of harsh interrogation techniques, and least likely to view the interrogation as torture, when the suspect was an illegal immigrant of Saudi Arabian descent who was accused of terrorism and interrogated abroad. Contrary to what was expected, there was no significant four-way interaction between crime type, citizenship status, ethnicity, and location of interrogation on any of the dependent variables. Moreover, there were no significant three-way or two-way interactions.

There were, however, a few significant main effects. As hypothesized and consistent with previous research (Narchet & Russano, 2009; 2010), there was a significant main effect of crime type on the endorsement of the use of harsh interrogation techniques $F(1, 224) = 5.03, p = .026$. Participants were significantly more likely to endorse the techniques when the suspect was accused of terrorism ($M = 5.76, s = .22$) as compared to child molestation ($M = 5.05, s = .22$). In addition, there was a marginally significant effect of ethnicity on the endorsement of the use of harsh interrogation techniques $F(1, 224) = 3.72, p = .055$, such that participants were significantly more likely to endorse the techniques when the suspect was Italian ($M = 5.71, s =$

.22) as compared to Saudi Arabian ($M = 5.10, s = .22$). Also, there was a marginally significant effect of ethnicity on the perception of whether the suspect was tortured $F(1, 224) = 3.23, p = .074$, such that participants were less likely to believe that the suspect was tortured when he was Italian ($M = 4.42, s = .17$) as compared to Saudi Arabian ($M = 3.98, s = .17$). There were no overall effects of citizenship status or location of the interrogation on any of the dependent variables.

A series of independent samples t-tests were conducted to decipher whether there was an effect of gender on any of the dependent measures. Although there was no effect of gender on perceptions of torture or participants' crime control orientation, there was a marginal effect of gender on the endorsement of the use of harsh interrogation techniques. Men ($M = 5.68, s = .24$) were more likely to endorse the use of harsh interrogation techniques than women ($M = 5.15, s = .21$), $t(236) = 1.67, p = .096$.

Correlational analyses were conducted in order to determine whether any systematic relationships existed between participant factors (e.g., age, race, criminal justice orientation, political affiliation) and the dependent variables. There was a positive correlation between age and criminal justice orientation ($r = .32, p < .001$), such that older people were more crime control oriented than younger people. There was also a positive correlation between criminal justice orientation and the endorsement of harsh interrogation techniques ($r = .63, p < .001$), such that people with a stronger crime control orientation were more likely to endorse the use of harsh interrogation techniques as compared to people who were more due process oriented. People with stronger crime control orientation were also less likely to perceive the interrogation as torture as compared to people who were more due process oriented ($r = .40, p < .001$). There were no other significant relationships found.

Discussion

The original hypothesis of the current study was that there would be a 4-way interaction, such that participants would be most likely to endorse the use of harsh interrogation techniques, and least likely to view the interrogation as torture, when the suspect was an illegal immigrant of Saudi Arabian descent who was accused of terrorism and interrogated abroad. This prediction was based on the findings of prior research (Narchet & Russano, 2009; 2010; Narchet, Russano & Griffin, 2008), as well as recent media coverage of events depicting the U.S. government's infliction of "enhanced" interrogation techniques upon Arabic and Iraqi suspects used to fight the world on terror. Contrary to this hypothesis, there was no significant four-way interaction between the independent variables of crime type, citizenship status, ethnicity, and location of interrogation on either of the two primary dependent variables (i.e., the endorsement of the use of harsh interrogation techniques and the extent to which the interrogation techniques were perceived as torture). Additionally, there were no significant 3-way or 2-way interactions found. One possible explanation for these null results is that ethnicity had an unexpected effect in this study (see below).

Consistent with Narchet, Russano and Griffin (2008), as well as Narchet and Russano (2009; 2010), the results of this study showed that participants' endorsement of the use of harsh interrogation techniques varied as a function of crime type. Participants were more approving of the use of harsh techniques when the suspect was accused of terrorism versus child molestation. There were no overall effects of citizenship status or location on either of the dependent variables. However, ethnicity influenced participants' perceptions in an unexpected way. Specifically, participants were more likely to endorse the use of harsh interrogation techniques when the suspect was Italian as compared to Saudi Arabian. In addition, participants were more

likely to view the interrogation as torture when the suspect was Saudi Arabian as compared to Italian. These results are in direct contrast with previous research by Narchet and Russano who found that participants were more likely to endorse the use of harsh interrogation techniques when the suspect was Saudi Arabian as compared to Italian.

One explanation for this unexpected finding may be the black sheep effect. Lewis and Sherman (2010) define the black sheep effect as when “negative ingroup members from high perceived entitativity groups may pose a meaningful threat to the perceiver’s social identity that can be alleviated by denigrating the target” (p. 211). In other words, when there is a strong association between group members, and one member’s actions present a serious threat to the group’s reputation, the group members are likely to take desperate measures to punish that member for their harmful actions as a way of distancing themselves from the deviant group member. The effect further explains that such punishment may be more harsh for the in-group member than would be inflicted on an outside individual whose actions may have also harmed the group’s reputation (Biernat, Vescio, & Billings, 1999). Lewis and Sherman (2010) discusses several possible reasons for the group’s treatment, which include the actions of the member bringing shame upon the other group members, threatening the welfare of other members, or jeopardizing the group’s overall reputation.

This current study’s sample, dominated by Whites (90.4%) from the Northeast (Massachusetts and Rhode Island), likely contained a large number of people of Italian descent, which may have led them to judge the Italian suspect more harshly than the Saudi Arabian suspect. The black sheep effect suggests that “by rejecting an unfavorable member of the ingroup- a ‘black sheep’ – the group’s overall positive image is preserved and protected” (Biernat, Vescio, & Billings, 1999, p. 524). Hence, the Italian suspect used within the scenarios

of this study may have been deemed the “black sheep” by participants who are of Italian descent; in other words, the Italian suspect may have posed as a threat to the reputation of the Italian people and triggered a response where their reputation had to be protected, leading them to judge the Italian suspect more harshly than the Saudi Arabian suspect. Previous research in this area by Narchet, Russano and colleagues also utilized Northeastern samples, however, they were generally more diverse; this might explain why the black sheep may have played a role in this study but not others.

A second possible explanation of the ethnicity findings may be reactivity. A subsidiary theory of reactivity is the Hawthorne Effect. Merrett (2006) explains that the Hawthorne Effect involves participants engaging in a study where they know that their actions in association to the experiment are being observed, recorded, and studied. It was clear and necessary for the participants of this study to know that their responses were part of an experiment. Although anonymity was explained and enforced, responses of the participants may have been affected by the recent negative publicity surrounding the use of “enhanced” interrogation techniques on terrorist suspects (primarily of Arab descent). As such, participants may have felt pressure to rate the harsh interrogation techniques as particularly inappropriate for the Saudi Arabian suspect, not because that is how they actually feel, but rather to provide what they believe to be the socially desirable response.

Allaf’s (2004) news article on the Abu Ghraib situation accentuates how influential the negative press has been by asserting that “it is the contempt on the abusers’ faces, their air of superiority and invulnerability, that will represent the attitude of America as a whole towards the Arab world” (p.4). Articles dispersed over the internet and featured in magazines regarding the war on terror, Abu Ghraib, and Guantanamo Bay situations may have been an influential factor

on participants' reactions to the treatment of the Saudi Arabian suspect as unacceptable. Fear of being judged as demeaning or in agreement with methods of interrogation that many consider inappropriate and/or immoral may have prompted the participants to respond in such a manner to distance themselves from the current image of the U.S. government and the Americans involved. Therefore, it is possible that participants responded to the questionnaire by being less harsh to the Saudi Arabian suspect as a way of expressing real or feigned sympathy for how detainees of Arabic descent have been treated in the past. One reason that reactivity might have been less of an issue in previous studies is that data collection for much of the previous research in this area occurred prior to 2008; in the past three years, there has been significantly more publicity surrounding the use of enhanced interrogation, including its condemnation by the Obama administration.

Limitations

A major shortcoming of this study involves the extent to which the finding can be generalized to the larger population. Convenience sampling resulted in a generally homogeneous sample, particularly with respect to race (a variable that may very well influence perceptions on these issues), age, and education/socioeconomic status. Moreover, the sample was gathered strictly from a limited area in New England; therefore, regional influences may have emerged had we been able to obtain a more diverse sample. Because of these sampling issues, we are limited in our ability to make generalizations based on our data to the larger U.S. population.

Another limitation of the study may have been that the manipulations were too obvious, leading to the reactivity issues described above. There was no deception utilized in this study, and it was clear to participants exactly what was being studied. This may have created demand

characteristics such that participants provided socially desirable responses, which may explain why our data failed to support our primary hypotheses.

Implications and Future Directions

The inability of this study to find the anticipated effects of citizenship status suggests that further research must be done to clarify its role in perceptions of enhanced interrogation techniques. In response to Narchet and Russano's (2009; 2010) studies, the citizenship factor has been altered from non-citizen to legal resident/non-citizen, and finally to the current study's manipulation of illegal immigrant. Consistently across all three studies, the citizenship factor measured failed to have any significant effects on the dependent variables assessed. Future research is needed to determine why the citizenship factor has had no effect; it is possible that this line of research is simply not adequately capturing an effect that exists or it is possible that citizenship status truly does not affect people's perceptions of the use of enhanced interrogation.

The current study also failed to find the anticipated effect of the ethnicity factor, where it was predicted that participants would be more likely to endorse the use of "enhanced" interrogation techniques when the suspect was of Saudi Arabian descent as compared to Italian descent. As discussed, this may be explained partially by the black sheep effect. Future studies should include a more detailed question about ethnicity in order to confirm or rule out this explanation. Knowing which participants were of Italian descent and which were not would allow for further analysis on existing in-group biases and assist in the explanation of the current study's finding that participants were more likely to endorse the use of "enhanced" interrogation techniques when the suspect was of Italian descent as compared to Saudi Arabian descent. In addition, to combat possible reactivity effects, it might be useful for future studies to use more

subtle manipulations and measures (e.g., use of cover stories, deception, physiological measures, etc.).

Lastly, the current study failed to find the anticipated effects of the location of interrogation factor. This factor was manipulated in response to the current existence of the extraordinary rendition program. The failure to find any significant effects for the factor suggests that participants may not have been educated enough through the media or elsewhere about the current debate on the extraordinary rendition program. Knowledge of this program would give participants more insight into the conditions that have been described to exist in Nasr City, Egypt, amongst other locations. This was the first of Narchet and Russano's study to measure the location of an interrogation as a factor; thus, future studies are needed to further examine its role in perceptions of enhanced interrogations.

Conclusion

The current study was conducted in effort to further clarify which factors are involved in determining when, if ever, it is acceptable to use extreme techniques when attempting to obtain vital information from a suspect. When a crisis strikes, such as a terrorist attack, it is essential for military and government officials to gather as much information about the attack as possible, in order to prevent another attack from occurring and to save innocent lives (i.e., Jeremy Bentham's "ticking bomb" theory). This calls for interrogating suspects/detainees to extract vital information pertaining to other threats and possible accomplices. However, a balance must be found that allows interrogators to perform their job successfully, while following ethical guidelines and preserving human rights. It is difficult to establish limits that constitute which interrogation methods cross the line into torture and which do not because perceptions of what torture actually is varies. The current study aimed to determine which factors play a role in an

individual's perception of torture. Knowledge and confirmation of such factors would assist in further clarifying a more agreed-upon definition of torture and preventing its use in future interrogations. Additionally, it is important to understand the public's perception of various interrogation techniques because public acceptance, or repudiation, of certain techniques can influence our country's leaders when determining what is, and what is not, acceptable.

References

- Allaf, R. (2004). Shock waves. *The World Today*, 60(6), 4-7.
- Biernat, M., Vescio, T. K., & Billings, L. S. (1999). Black sheep and expectancy violation: integrating two models of social judgment. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 523-542.
- Greenburg, J. C., Rosenberg, H. L., & de Vogue, A. (2008, April 9). Sources: Top Bush advisors approved 'enhanced interrogation.' *ABC News*. Retrieved from <http://abcnews.go.com/TheLaw/LawPolitics/story?id=4583256&page=1>
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 339-375.
- Kleinig, J. (2005). Ticking bombs and torture warrants. *Deakin Law Review*, 10(2), 614-627.
- Lewis, A. C. & Sherman, S. J. (2010). Perceived entitativity and the black-sheep effect: When will we denigrate negative ingroup members? *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 150(2), 211-225.
- McSherry, J. P. (2009). Counterterrorism wars and human rights: From Operation Condor to the present. *NACLA Report on the Americas*, 10-14.
- Merrett, F. (2006). Reflections on the Hawthorne Effect. *Educational Psychology*, 26(1), 143-146.
- Narchet, F. M. & Russano, M. B. (2009, November). *The effect of crime type and citizenship on perceptions of torture*. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology 2009 Annual Conference, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Narchet, F. M. & Russano, M. B. (2010, March). The effect of crime type, ethnicity, and

citizenship status on perceptions of enhanced interrogation tactics. Presented at the American Psychology Law Society Annual Conference in Vancouver, Canada.

Narchet, F. M., Russano, M. B., & Griffin, J. (2008, March). *The effect of crime type on perceptions of "enhanced" interrogation techniques*. Poster presented at the 2008 American Psychology-Law Conference, Jacksonville, FL.

Norris, J. I., Larsen, J. T., & Stastny, B. J. (2010). Social perceptions of torture: Genuine disagreement, subtle malleability, and in-group bias. *Peace and Conflict, 16*, 275-294.
doi: 10.1080/10781919.2010.488164

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Appendix A

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Omar Al Harbi, a U.S. born citizen of Saudi Arabian descent, is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was solely responsible for performing background checks and gathering proper documentation for its employees; Omar Al Harbi was verified as a U.S. citizen.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Omar Al Harbi was involved in a foiled terrorist plot to blow up the Golden Gate Bridge. The tipster indicated that Al Harbi had made contact with a local Al-Qaeda cell. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other terrorist attacks were scheduled to occur in the near future. Military intelligence investigators brought Al Harbi to the base for questioning the next day.

Omar Al Harbi agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Al Harbi's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Al Harbi that he was involved in the terrorist plot. Because of the strong possibility of future terrorist attacks and the need to identify Al Harbi's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Al Harbi as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Al Harbi, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Al Harbi by his shirt and shaking him, using an open hand to slap Al Harbi on the face (with intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Al Harbi's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Al Harbi admitted that he knew who had been involved with the plot, but he refused to provide further details or information about future attacks. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Al Harbi was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Al Harbi indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Al Harbi confessed to his role in the terrorist plot, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Omar Al Harbi, a U.S. born citizen of Saudi Arabian descent, is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was solely responsible for performing background checks and gathering proper documentation for its employees; Omar Al Harbi was verified as a U.S. citizen.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Omar Al Harbi was involved in a foiled terrorist plot to blow up the Golden Gate Bridge. The tipster indicated that Al Harbi had made contact with a local Al-Qaeda cell. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other terrorist attacks were scheduled to occur in the near future. Given that Al Harbi was accused of terrorist acts, it was determined that the interrogation would likely be more extensive than usual. Therefore, military intelligence investigators determined that Al Harbi should be dealt with under the extraordinary rendition program. He was transferred abroad to a base in Nasr City, Egypt, and he was questioned the following day.

Omar Al Harbi agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Al Harbi's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Al Harbi that he was involved in the terrorist plot. Because of the strong possibility of future terrorist attacks and the need to identify Al Harbi's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Al Harbi as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Al Harbi, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Al Harbi by his shirt and shaking him, using an open hand to slap Al Harbi on the face (with intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Al Harbi's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Al Harbi admitted that he know who had been involved with the plot, but he refused to provide further details or information about future attacks. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Al Harbi was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Al Harbi indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Al Harbi confessed to his role in the terrorist plot, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Omar Al Harbi traveled to the United States from Saudi Arabia on a J-1 travel visa in 2002. Al Harbi's visa expired after his two month allotment, and he has since resided in the United States as an illegal immigrant. Omar Al Harbi is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The army hired the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. to perform services on the base, and the contractor was solely responsible for hiring its employees. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was responsible for gathering proper documentation for its employees and failed to follow-through with this procedure. Unbeknownst to the military, The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. had hired illegal immigrants to work on base, including Omar Al Harbi.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Omar Al Harbi was involved in a foiled terrorist plot to blow up the Golden Gate Bridge. The tipster indicated that Al Harbi had made contact with a local Al-Qaeda cell. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other terrorist attacks were scheduled to occur in the near future. Military intelligence investigators brought Al Harbi to the base for questioning the next day.

Omar Al Harbi agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Al Harbi's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Al Harbi that he was involved in the terrorist plot. Because of the strong possibility of future terrorist attacks and the need to identify Al Harbi's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Al Harbi as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Al Harbi, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Al Harbi by his shirt and shaking him, using an open hand to slap Al Harbi on the face (with intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Al Harbi's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Al Harbi admitted that he know who had been involved with the plot, but he refused to provide further details or information about future attacks. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Al Harbi was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Al Harbi indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Al Harbi confessed to his role in the terrorist plot, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Omar Al Harbi traveled to the United States from Saudi Arabia on a J-1 travel visa in 2002. Al Harbi's visa expired after his two month allotment, and he has since resided in the United States as an illegal immigrant. Omar Al Harbi is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The army base hired the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. to perform services on the base, and the contractor was solely responsible for hiring their own employees. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was responsible for gathering proper documentation for its employees and failed to follow-through with this procedure. Unbeknownst to the military, The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. had hired illegal immigrants to work on base, including Omar Al Harbi.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Omar Al Harbi was involved in a foiled terrorist plot to blow up the Golden Gate Bridge. The tipster indicated that Al Harbi had made contact with a local Al-Qaeda cell. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other terrorist attacks were scheduled to occur in the near future. Given that Al Harbi was accused of terrorist acts, it was determined that the interrogation would likely be more extensive than usual. Therefore, military intelligence investigators determined that Al Harbi should be dealt with under the extraordinary rendition program. He was transferred abroad to a base in Nasr City, Egypt, and he was questioned the following day.

Omar Al Harbi agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Al Harbi's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Al Harbi that he was involved in the terrorist plot. Because of the strong possibility of future terrorist attacks and the need to identify Al Harbi's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Al Harbi as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Al Harbi, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Al Harbi by his shirt and shaking him, using an open hand to slap Al Harbi on the face (with intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Al Harbi's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Al Harbi admitted that he know who had been involved with the plot, but he refused to provide further details or information about future attacks. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Al Harbi was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Al Harbi indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Al Harbi confessed to his role in the terrorist plot, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Anthony Giordano, a U.S. born citizen of Italian descent, is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was solely responsible for performing background checks and gathering proper documentation for its employees; Anthony Giordano was verified as a U.S. citizen.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Anthony Giordano was involved in a foiled terrorist plot to blow up the Golden Gate Bridge. The tipster indicated that Anthony Giordano had made contact with a local Al-Qaeda cell. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other terrorist attacks were scheduled to occur in the near future. Military intelligence investigators brought Giordano to the base for questioning the next day.

Anthony Giordano agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Giordano's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Giordano that he was involved in the terrorist plot. Because of the strong possibility of future terrorist attacks and the need to identify Giordano's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Giordano as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Giordano, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Giordano by his shirt and shaking him, using an open hand to slap Giordano on the face (with intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Giordano's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Giordano admitted that he knew who had been involved with the plot, but he refused to provide further details or information about future attacks. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Giordano was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Giordano indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Giordano confessed to his role in the terrorist plot, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Anthony Giordano, a U.S. born citizen of Italian descent, is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was solely responsible for performing background checks and gathering proper documentation for its employees; Anthony Giordano was verified as a U.S. citizen.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Anthony Giordano was involved in a foiled terrorist plot to blow up the Golden Gate Bridge. The tipster indicated that Anthony Giordano had made contact with a local Al-Qaeda cell. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other terrorist attacks were scheduled to occur in the near future.

Given that Giordano was accused of terrorist acts, it was determined that the interrogation would likely be more extensive than usual. Therefore, military intelligence investigators determined that Giordano should be dealt with under the extraordinary rendition program. He was transferred abroad to a base in Nasr City, Egypt, and he was questioned the following day.

Anthony Giordano agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Giordano's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Giordano that he was involved in the terrorist plot. Because of the strong possibility of future terrorist attacks and the need to identify Giordano's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Giordano as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Giordano, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Giordano by his shirt and shaking him, using an open hand to slap Giordano on the face (with intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Giordano's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Giordano admitted that he knew who had been involved with the plot, but he refused to provide further details or information about future attacks. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Giordano was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Giordano indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Giordano confessed to his role in the terrorist plot, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Anthony Giordano traveled to the United States from Italy on a J-1 travel visa in 2002. Giordano's visa expired after his two month allotment, and he has since resided in the United States as an illegal immigrant. Anthony Giordano is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The army base hired the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. to perform services on the base, and the contractor was solely responsible for hiring their own employees. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was responsible for gathering proper documentation for its employees and failed to follow-through with this procedure. Unbeknownst to the military, The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. had hired illegal immigrants to work on base, including Anthony Giordano.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Anthony Giordano was involved in a foiled terrorist plot to blow up the Golden Gate Bridge. The tipster indicated that Anthony Giordano had made contact with a local Al-Qaeda cell. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other terrorist attacks were scheduled to occur in the near future. Military intelligence investigators brought Giordano to the base for questioning the next day.

Anthony Giordano agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Giordano's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Giordano that he was involved in the terrorist plot. Because of the strong possibility of future terrorist attacks and the need to identify Giordano's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Giordano as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Giordano, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Giordano by his shirt and shaking him, using an open hand to slap Giordano on the face (with intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Giordano's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Giordano admitted that he know who had been involved with the plot, but he refused to provide further details or information about future attacks. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Giordano was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Giordano indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Giordano confessed to his role in the terrorist plot, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Anthony Giordano traveled to the United States from Italy on a J-1 travel visa in 2002. Giordano's visa expired after his two month allotment, and he has since resided in the United States as an illegal immigrant. Anthony Giordano is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The army hired the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. to perform services on the base, and the contractor was solely responsible for hiring their own employees. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was responsible for gathering proper documentation for its employees and failed to follow-through with this procedure. Unbeknownst to the military, The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. had hired illegal immigrants to work on base, including Anthony Giordano.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Anthony Giordano was involved in a foiled terrorist plot to blow up the Golden Gate Bridge. The tipster indicated that Anthony Giordano had made contact with a local Al-Qaeda cell. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other terrorist attacks were scheduled to occur in the near future. Given that Giordano was accused of terrorist acts, it was determined that the interrogation would likely be more extensive than usual. Therefore, military intelligence investigators determined that Giordano should be dealt with under the extraordinary rendition program. He was transferred abroad to a base in Nasr City, Egypt, and he was questioned the following day.

Anthony Giordano agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Giordano's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Giordano that he was involved in the terrorist plot. Because of the strong possibility of future terrorist attacks and the need to identify Giordano's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Giordano as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Giordano, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Giordano by his shirt and shaking him, using an open hand to slap Giordano on the face (with intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Giordano's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Giordano admitted that he know who had been involved with the plot, but he refused to provide further details or information about future attacks. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Giordano was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Giordano indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Giordano confessed to his role in the terrorist plot, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Omar Al Harbi, a U.S. born citizen of Saudi Arabian descent, is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was solely responsible for performing background checks and gathering proper documentation for its employees; Omar Al Harbi was verified as a U.S. citizen.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Omar Al Harbi had molested at least one child living on the army base. The tipster indicated that Al Harbi had become associated with a world-wide internet pornography ring being posted on an international website, and that he recently participated in the making of a child pornography video during which he had sex with a prepubescent child. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other films were scheduled to be produced in the near future. Because at least one of the children in question lived on the military base, military intelligence investigators brought Al Harbi to the base for questioning the next day.

Omar Al Harbi agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Al Harbi's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Al Harbi that he was involved in the child molestation. Because of the strong possibility of more child victims attacks and the need to identify Al Harbi's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Al Harbi as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Al Harbi, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Al Harbi by his shirt and shaking him, using an open-hand to slap Al Harbi on the face (with the intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Al Harbi's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Al Harbi admitted that he knew who had been involved with the child molestation, but he refused to provide further details or information about future child victims. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Al Harbi was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Al Harbi indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Al Harbi confessed to his role in the child molestation, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Omar Al Harbi, a U.S. born citizen of Saudi Arabian descent, is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was solely responsible for performing background checks and gathering proper documentation for its employees; Omar Al Harbi was verified as a U.S. citizen.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Omar Al Harbi had molested at least one child living on the army base. The tipster indicated that Al Harbi had become associated with a world-wide internet pornography ring being posted on an international website, and that he recently participated in the making of a child pornography video during which he had sex with a prepubescent child. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other films were scheduled to be produced in the near future. Given the international nature of the crime and the seriousness of the alleged offense, it was determined that the interrogation would likely be more extensive than usual. Therefore, military intelligence investigators determined that Al Harbi should be dealt with under the extraordinary rendition program. He was transferred abroad to a base in Nasr City, Egypt, and he was questioned the following day.

Omar Al Harbi agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Al Harbi's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Al Harbi that he was involved in the child molestation. Because of the strong possibility of more child victims attacks and the need to identify Al Harbi's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Al Harbi as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Al Harbi, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Al Harbi by his shirt and shaking him, using an open-hand to slap Al Harbi on the face (with the intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Al Harbi's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Al Harbi admitted that he knew who had been involved with the child molestation, but he refused to provide further details or information about future child victims. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Al Harbi was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Al Harbi indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Al Harbi confessed to his role in the child molestation, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Omar Al Harbi traveled to the United States from Saudi Arabia on a J-1 travel visa in 2002. Al Harbi's visa expired after his two month allotment, and he has since resided in the United States as an illegal immigrant. Omar Al Harbi is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The army hired the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. to perform services on the base, and the contractor was solely responsible for hiring their own employees. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was responsible for gathering proper documentation for its employees and failed to follow-through with this procedure. Unbeknownst to the military, The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. had hired illegal immigrants to work on base, including Omar Al Harbi.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Omar Al Harbi had molested at least one child living on the army base. . The tipster indicated that Al Harbi had become associated with a world-wide internet pornography ring being posted on an international website, and that he recently participated in the making of a child pornography video during which he had sex with a prepubescent child. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other films were scheduled to be produced in the near future. Because at least one of the children in question lived on the military base, military intelligence investigators brought Al Harbi to the base for questioning the next day.

Omar Al Harbi agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Al Harbi's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Al Harbi that he was involved in the child molestation. Because of the strong possibility of more child victims attacks and the need to identify Al Harbi's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Al Harbi as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Al Harbi, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Al Harbi by his shirt and shaking him, using an open-hand to slap Al Harbi on the face (with the intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Al Harbi's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Al Harbi admitted that he knew who had been involved with the child molestation, but he refused to provide further details or information about future child victims. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Al Harbi was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Al Harbi indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Al Harbi confessed to his role in the child molestation, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Omar Al Harbi traveled to the United States from Saudi Arabia on a J-1 travel visa in 2002. Al Harbi's visa expired after his two month allotment, and he has since resided in the United States as an illegal immigrant. Omar Al Harbi is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The army hired the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. to perform services on the base, and the contractor was solely responsible for hiring their own employees. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was responsible for gathering proper documentation for its employees and failed to follow-through with this procedure. Unbeknownst to the military, The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. had hired illegal immigrants to work on base, including Omar Al Harbi.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Omar Al Harbi had molested at least one child living on the army base. The tipster indicated that Al Harbi had become associated with a world-wide internet pornography ring being posted on an international website, and that he recently participated in the making of a child pornography video during which he had sex with a prepubescent child. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other films were scheduled to be produced in the near future. Given the international nature of the crime and the seriousness of the alleged offense, it was determined that the interrogation would likely be more extensive than usual. Therefore, military intelligence investigators determined that Al Harbi should be dealt with under the extraordinary rendition program. He was transferred abroad to a base in Nasr City, Egypt, and he was questioned the following day.

Omar Al Harbi agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Al Harbi's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Al Harbi that he was involved in the child molestation. Because of the strong possibility of more child victims attacks and the need to identify Al Harbi's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Al Harbi as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Al Harbi, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Al Harbi by his shirt and shaking him, using an open-hand to slap Al Harbi on the face (with the intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Al Harbi's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Al Harbi admitted that he knew who had been involved with the child molestation, but he refused to provide further details or information about future child victims. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Al Harbi was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Al Harbi indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Al Harbi confessed to his role in the child molestation, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Anthony Giordano, a U.S. born citizen of Italian descent, is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was solely responsible for performing background checks and gathering proper documentation for its employees; Anthony Giordano was verified as a U.S. citizen.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Anthony Giordano had molested at least one child living on the army base. The tipster indicated that Giordano had become associated with a world-wide internet pornography ring being posted on an international website, and that he recently participated in the making of a child pornography video during which he had sex with a prepubescent child. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other films were scheduled to be produced in the near future. Because at least one of the children in question lived on the military base, military intelligence investigators brought Giordano to the base for questioning the next day.

Anthony Giordano agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Giordano's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Giordano that he was involved in the child molestation. Because of the strong possibility of more child victims attacks and the need to identify Giordano's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Giordano as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Giordano, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Giordano by his shirt and shaking him, using an open-hand to slap Giordano on the face (with the intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Giordano's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Giordano admitted that he knew who had been involved with the child molestation, but he refused to provide further details or information about future child victims. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Giordano was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Giordano indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Giordano confessed to his role in the child molestation, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Anthony Giordano, a U.S. born citizen of Italian descent, is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was solely responsible for performing background checks and gathering proper documentation for its employees; Anthony Giordano was verified as a U.S. citizen.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Anthony Giordano had molested at least one child living on the army base. The tipster indicated that Giordano had become associated with a world-wide internet pornography ring being posted on an international website, and that he recently participated in the making of a child pornography video during which he had sex with a prepubescent child. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other films were scheduled to be produced in the near future. Given the international nature of the crime and the seriousness of the alleged offense, it was determined that the interrogation would likely be more extensive than usual. Therefore, military intelligence investigators determined that Giordano should be dealt with under the extraordinary rendition program. He was transferred abroad to a base in Nasr City, Egypt, and he was questioned the following day.

Anthony Giordano agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Giordano's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Giordano that he was involved in the child molestation. Because of the strong possibility of more child victims attacks and the need to identify Giordano's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Giordano as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Giordano, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Giordano by his shirt and shaking him, using an open-hand to slap Giordano on the face (with the intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Giordano's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Giordano admitted that he knew who had been involved with the child molestation, but he refused to provide further details or information about future child victims. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Giordano was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Giordano indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Giordano confessed to his role in the child molestation, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Anthony Giordano traveled to the United States from Italy on a J-1 travel visa in 2002. Giordano's visa expired after his two month allotment, and he has since resided in the United States as an illegal immigrant. Anthony Giordano is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The army base hired the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. to perform services on the base, and the contractor was solely responsible for hiring their own employees. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was responsible for gathering proper documentation for its employees and failed to follow-through with this procedure. Unbeknownst to the military, The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. had hired illegal immigrants to work on base, including Anthony Giordano.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Anthony Giordano had molested at least one child living on the army base. The tipster indicated that Giordano had become associated with a world-wide internet pornography ring being posted on an international website, and that he recently participated in the making of a child pornography video during which he had sex with a prepubescent child. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other films were scheduled to be produced in the near future. Because at least one of the children in question lived on the military base, military intelligence investigators brought Giordano to the base for questioning the next day.

Anthony Giordano agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Giordano's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Giordano that he was involved in the child molestation. Because of the strong possibility of more child victims attacks and the need to identify Giordano's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Giordano as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Giordano, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Giordano by his shirt and shaking him, using an open-hand to slap Giordano on the face (with the intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Giordano's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Giordano admitted that he knew who had been involved with the child molestation, but he refused to provide further details or information about future child victims. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Giordano was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Giordano indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Giordano confessed to his role in the child molestation, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Please read the following scenario carefully.

Anthony Giordano traveled to the United States from Italy on a J-1 travel visa in 2002. Giordano's visa expired after his two month allotment, and he has since resided in the United States as an illegal immigrant. Anthony Giordano is employed by the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. as a contracted janitorial technician on an army base in Presidio of Monterey, California, about two hours south of San Francisco. The army base hired the B. Hudson Janitorial Co. to perform services on the base, and the contractor was solely responsible for hiring their own employees. The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. was responsible for gathering proper documentation for its employees and failed to follow-through with this procedure. Unbeknownst to the military, The B. Hudson Janitorial Co. had hired illegal immigrants to work on base, including Anthony Giordano.

On January 16, 2010, the military investigators received a tip from an anonymous source that Anthony Giordano had molested at least one child living on the army base. The tipster indicated that Giordano had become associated with a world-wide internet pornography ring being posted on an international website, and that he recently participated in the making of a child pornography video during which he had sex with a prepubescent child. The tipster also indicated that he believed several other films were scheduled to be produced in the near future. Given the international nature of the crime and the seriousness of the alleged offense, it was determined that the interrogation would likely be more extensive than usual. Therefore, military intelligence investigators determined that Giordano should be dealt with under the extraordinary rendition program. He was transferred abroad to a base in Nasr City, Egypt, and he was questioned the following day.

Anthony Giordano agreed to speak with the investigators. Although he repeatedly denied any knowledge or involvement in the crime, Giordano's story was inconsistent. The investigators became convinced while talking to Giordano that he was involved in the child molestation. Because of the strong possibility of more child victims attacks and the need to identify Giordano's accomplices, the investigators felt it was critically important to get as much information out of Giordano as possible. When typical interrogation tactics did not solicit cooperation from Giordano, the investigators decided to utilize more aggressive measures. These measures included forcefully grabbing Giordano by his shirt and shaking him, using an open-hand to slap Giordano on the face (with the intent to cause mild pain and fear), and administering a hard, open-handed slap to Giordano's stomach, which caused pain, but not internal injury.

In response to these tactics, Giordano admitted that he knew who had been involved with the child molestation, but he refused to provide further details or information about future child victims. At this point, the investigators believed that further interrogation was warranted. In an interrogation cell that was kept at 50 degrees Fahrenheit, Giordano was forced to stand naked, while handcuffed and with his feet shackled to an eye bolt on the floor, for approximately 10 hours. He was occasionally doused with cold water in order to encourage cooperation. As exhaustion set in, Giordano indicated he was ready to provide specific information to the investigators.

Giordano confessed to his role in the child molestation, and he provided the military investigators with the names of several other possible accomplices.

Which of the following groups best represents your political affiliation or beliefs?

- Democrat
- Republican
- Independent
- Other

Thank you for participating!

Appendix C

Informed Consent Agreement

You are invited to participate in a study entitled “Perception of Enhanced Interrogation.” The researcher in charge of this study is Melissa B. Russano, Ph.D. We hope to learn people’s perceptions of enhanced interrogation methods. We ask that you read the following statement and sign the form if you agree to participate:

I understand that if I agree to be in this study, I will be asked to read a short scenario and answer a series of question related to that scenario.

The total time required to complete this experiment should be approximately 15 minutes. I will be one of approximately 240 participants in this study.

I understand that participation in this study will provide me with an opportunity to learn more about enhanced interrogation. Another benefit of my participation is that it will help to further knowledge in this area of research. I understand that there is minimal or less than minimal risk to me as a participant in this study.

I understand that any information obtained in connection with this study will be strictly confidential. In any written reports or publications, no one will be identified or identifiable and only aggregate data will be presented. Research records will be kept in a locked file; only the researchers will have access to the records.

I understand that if I decide to participate, I am free to discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

I have been given the right to ask questions concerning the procedure, and any questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that if any new findings are developed during the time that I am in the study that may affect my willingness to continue to be in the study, I will be informed as soon as possible. If I desire further information about this research project I understand that I may contact Dr. Melissa Russano at (401) 254-3878. I have been offered a copy of this informed consent.

This is to certify that I consent to or give permission for my participation as a volunteer in this research study. By signing this informed consent agreement, I am verifying that I am at least 18 years old. I have read this form and understand the content.

Participant’s Name (Print Name)

Date_____

Participant’s signature